

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

RENNTA CHRISDIANA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
and DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendants-Appellees.

FOR PUBLICATION
April 29, 2008

No. 276347
Ingham Circuit Court
LC No. 06-001112-CZ

Advance Sheets Version

RENNTA CHRISDIANA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendant-Appellee,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH,

Defendant.

No. 276440
Ingham Circuit Court

LC No. 06-001112-CZ

Before: Whitbeck, P.J., and Jansen and Davis, JJ.

WHITBECK, P.J. (*concurring*).

While I agree with the majority's conclusion that the "for employment purposes" residency requirement of defendant state agencies is consistent and compatible with the intent of the pertinent state and federal legislation, I would reach this determination by relying on the plain language of the legislation alone rather than resorting to examination of the legislative history, particularly bill analyses.

"The problem with relying on bill analyses is that they do not necessarily represent the views of even a single legislator. Rather, they are prepared by House and Senate staff. Indeed, the analyses themselves note that they do not constitute an official statement of legislative intent."¹

Therefore, bill analyses "are of 'considerably diminished quality,' and thus 'are entitled to little judicial consideration in resolving ambiguous statutory provisions . . .'"²

I agree with the remainder of the majority's conclusions regarding the issues presented.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck

¹ *Lansing Mayor v Pub Service Comm*, 470 Mich 154, 170 n 8; 680 NW2d 840 (2004), quoting *Frank W Lynch & Co v Flex Technologies, Inc*, 463 Mich 578, 588 n 7; 624 NW2d 180 (2001).

² *Id.* at 169-170, quoting *In re Certified Question (Kenneth Henes v Continental Biomass Ind, Inc)*, 468 Mich 109, 115 n 5; 659 NW2d 597 (2003).